A3

21 February 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ATTENTION:

THROUGH:

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Speed Letter dated 30 January 1967

1. Analysis of the UFO image on the provided photography was performed to the limited extent permitted by the copy prints. It must be remembered that the conclusions presented are based on the evaluation of copies rather than the originals. The copying process veils not only the grain and flare characteristics of the original image, but also may distort the accuracy of mensuration even when the exact enlargement parameters are known. In this case, these parameters are unknown.

2. The following was assumed for the basis of this analysis. The accuracy of these assumptions, however, is questioned.

a. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is the same.

b. The total enlargement factor of prints two and five is the same.

c. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is approximately two times that of prints two and five.

3. Findings:

a. The pattern of apparent grain clumping is similar on prints one and three and on prints two and five.

b. The edges of the UFO image appear more sharply defined in print one than do those of the helicopter image in print three.

T-13

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Speed Letter dated 30 January 1967

c. Contrast and density analysis of the images was not considered valid due to the inherent distortions caused by the copying process.

d. The edge sharpness of the UFO image in print two appears quite similar to the edge sharpness of the pipe in the same print.

e. It is assumed that the difference in image size between prints two and five was caused by a change in camera to UFO distance. This distance was less in print five than in print two. The following two conditions are offered:

(1) Considering a large UFO at a distance of approximately a quarter mile (1,000 feet) and a stationary camera location, the UFO would have had to travel a considerable distance (200 feet) in a flight line almost directly toward the camera position to produce such a change in image size.

(2) Considering a small, stationary UFO at a distance of approximately six feet and a slightly variable (± one foot) in camera location, a change in image size of this magnitude would have resulted from a change in camera location of less than the above variable.

f. has reviewed the quantitative results obtained by and has found no discrepancies in what has been done. Unfortunately, with the material available very little objective information can be obtained except building some tables of object size versus distance from the camera station. feels that the original prints would enable further photogrammetric study by providing the total geometric framework and imagery of the encounter. It is anticipated that this study would concentrate on three areas:

(1) [illegible] reconstruction including sizes, distances, and angles.

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Sneed Letter dated 30 January 1967

(2) Stereoscopic analysis of the UFO and its relationship with the surrounding branches, pole, and camera station.

(3) Dynamic analysis of the relative movement of the system including camera station and UFO.

4. Conclusion:

None definite. To decide the authenticity of the image as being a UFO is not possible from the furnished prints. It is probable that an analysis of the original photograph would provide added information which would enable a definite conclusion. Associated facts such as the families reluctance to discuss or show the original photographs, the convenient location of the wire frame through which the photographs were taken and the difference in scale of the UFO image between prints two and five which is most easily explained with a model tends to substantiate the model theory. No definite conclusion as to whether the object is either a model or a genuine UFO can be offered at this time.